1988

Teacher evaluation and administration effectiveness

William F. Elliott

TEACHER EVALUATION AND

ADMINISTRATION EFFECTIVENESS

A Project

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University

San Bernardino

---

by

William F. Elliott

May, 1988

Approved By:

[redacted] 8/15/88

Dr. G. Keith Dolan Date

[redacted]

Dr. Thomas E. Woods

TEACHER EVALUATION AND ADMINISTRATION EFFECTIVENESS

A Project

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University

San Bernardino

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

in

Educational Administration

---

by

William F. Elliott

April, 1988

TEACHER EVALUATION AND

ADMINISTRATION EFFECTIVENESS

A Project

Presented to the

Faculty of

California State University

San Bernardino

---

by

William F. Elliott

May, 1988

Approved By:

Dr. Griffith	Education	Date
Dr Wood		
Dr. Dolan		

ABSTRACT

The author will examine some of the written research relating to attitudes of teachers toward being evaluated and how the supervisory behavior of their school administration helps mold their feeling about this.

In order to have a positive attitude about being evaluated, teachers wish to have input in the evaluation process. Teachers want the process to be used as a method to help them become better educators. It was also found that teachers attitudes toward being evaluated were directly related to how they viewed their principal's own effectiveness.

The administration should think of themselves as supervisors and be appropriately skilled as such. They must work with teachers to develop their strengths and pinpoint areas which need improvement and focus on how to improve them.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

The concept of educational evaluation is not new nor limited in scope; each year finds many assessments of teaching programs underway. Varied methods of teaching are tried by young and old teachers alike. In order to determine the effectiveness of these methods, a process of evaluation should be used by the administration.

EFFECTIVE ADMINISTRATION

In the pages that follow the author will examine some of the literature pertaining to the attitudes of teachers toward teacher evaluation and how the supervisory behavior of their school administrators helps to determine their feelings about being evaluated. Research shows that the success of an evaluation program is related to the attitudes and perceptions held by the teachers toward the principal and their participation in the process.

To determine how teachers' feelings toward evaluation may be related to the administrator's competence, it is essential to define qualities that go into the makeup of the successful, effective administrator.

According to John Roueche and George Baker, effective administrators possess seven qualities:

he/she 1) allows for autonomy and innovation: 2) brings cohesiveness within the organization: 3) has commitment to the school mission: 4) shows recognition of staff: 5) demonstrates problem solving through collaboration: 6) proves effective delegation of responsibilities: 7) and focuses on teaching and learning.[1]

The faculty handbook provided to teachers at Daggett Middle School in Daggett, California, defines the job of the principal in administration as basically one of providing a system for the close personal relationships existing in a small school system, of developing and maintaining a good outlook about the operations of the school system and each job and jobholder as relative to those operation, and to develop specific ways of functioning that are representative of its personal concerns.

---

[1]Roueche, John E. and George A. Baker, III. Profiling Excellence in America's Schools, Arlington, VA, American Association of School Administrators, 1986, p.42.

The University of Texas at Austin conducted a study of the leadership skills of elementary and secondary principals over a five year period. The results, discussed by William L. Rutherford indicate five qualities held by effective principals.[2] They noted that effective principals have close interpersonal relationships with their teachers. A principal who has close interpersonal relationships with his staff promotes democratic cooperation in formulating policy and has specific knowledge of the special abilities and strengths of his staff. By his/her own calmness in crisis situations, he/she assists the group in meeting its various responsibilities. A principal who has the respect of the teachers not only communicates his/her position, but he/she listens to them as well. This helps develop a greater interest in educational problems, ideas and trends. In such a climate, it is easier to reach group agreement on policy design and implementation. Finally, the effective administrator has a vision for the future of his/her school.[3]

On the other hand, the ineffective administrator creates the evaluation policy by himself/herself and then attempts to impose it on the teachers. There is no

---

[2]Rutherford, W. L., "School Principals As Effective Leaders" Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1985, p.31.

[3]Ibid., p.34

cooperative effort involving the teachers themselves in any educational program design. This type of ineffective leadership does not delegate authority as the entire show is run by the leader alone. According to Rutherford,[4] the ineffective administrator tends to explode over trifles and repeatedly makes the same mistakes, although refusing to admit to doing so.

This Texas study does not claim that behavioral characteristics solely determine effectiveness. Knowledge of the job is, of course, another very vital factor in attaining effectiveness, including the ability to choose one's staff well and plan effectively for the needs of the school system. However, the research also indicates that while knowledge is necessary, it alone cannot predict the effective administrator. Behavior characteristics such as democratic cooperation, highly developed communication skills and an eye to the future play key roles in leadership performance. A good administrator must be able to define problems, have flexibility for experimenting, be able to interest others, and should profit from past experience.[5]

In another effort to pinpoint administrative success criteria, William J. Genova notes that ideas as to what forms administrative success vary from group to

---

[4]Ibid., p.33

[5]Ibid., p.34

group.[6] Teachers and school supervisors may differ significantly in their perceptions of the effective principal. This phenomenon, noted in several studies by different groups, might be due to race, the sex of the administrator, teaching experience, as well as other undefined factors. According to this study, it would seem that perceptions of effectiveness are not enough to establish basic guidelines as to who is a successful leader and who is not.

James N. Young and Robert L. Heicherberger have also conducted studies based on teachers' perceptions of an effective school supervision and evaluation program.[7] According to their research, teachers seek educational leadership rather than a checklist of how they need to improve. The latter kind of supervision often causes tensions in the teacher, bringing about unhappiness and job dissatisfaction.[8]

Teachers are being increasingly held accountable for results as measured by achievement tests. Demands by governmental bodies, school "watchdog" groups and

---

[6]Genova, William J., et. al. Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education. Cambridge, Massachusetts, 1976.

[7]Young, James N., and Robert L. Heichberger. "Teachers' Perceptions of an Effective School Supervision and Evaluation Program." Education, 96:1 (Fall, 1975), p.12.

[8]Ibid., p.10.

administration, that evaluation take place may result in a collection of data that have little relevance to providing the type of information which proves useful. Unfortunately, many evaluation processes do not contain information necessary to programs, nor ways of implementing or designing fresh, effective teaching methods. Rather it is seen as a disciplinary tactic used by the ineffective principal.

While the administrator may effectively handle the budget, coordinate district policy and public relations, rarely does he/she provide instructional leadership using the results of evaluation. In view of this, it is interesting that 82 percent of the teachers surveyed felt a definite need for supervision and evaluation; at the same time, 70 percent saw the supervisor as potentially dangerous when cast as an evaluator. Only 16 percent of the teachers favored evaluation from their principal.[9]

It should, then come as little surprise that 100 percent of the teachers polled by Young and Heichberger felt that they must play a major role in developing and selecting an evaluation program; they demand to know exactly the criteria against which they will be judged.[10] Teachers, on the whole, do not desire to just

---

[9]Ibid., pp.10-11.

[10]Ibid., p.12.

be evaluated. Rather, they see evaluation as only one way of improving teacher performance. In order that evaluation may be viewed as part of administrative effectiveness, it is important to state that 91 percent of the teachers believed the supervisor must exhibit understanding of the educational philosophy of teachers and of how the teacher views his own profession.[11] Only with such understanding can effective teaching programs be designed, learning programs successfully implemented, and evaluations be made a creative, rather than a destructive process. Therefore, conclude Young and Heichberger, evaluation and its effective supervision are needed to protect students from incompetent teaching, to follow the curriculum, and to aid each teacher to reach and maintain maximum effectiveness in instruction.

Teachers feel that the principals do not care very much about supervision and evaluation. In fact, 21 percent of the teachers questioned viewed their leader as "passive."[12] Supervisors themselves tend to agree that their chief function is one involved most heavily in business management, not that of teaching and learning. Most teachers, 62 percent, desired a helping relationship with their supervisor while only 1 percent

---

[11]Ibid., p.11.

[12]Ibid., p.12.

wanted an evaluator relationship.[13] Teachers feel that the evaluation process should be one of sharing responsibility with the supervisor in any changes to occur.

The teachers in the survey expressed very positive ideas on how to handle evaluation. Seventy percent felt that the administrator and each teacher should agree on educational objectives and then work together in trying to reach these objectives. This mutually established approach to supervision and evaluation was preferred.[14]

In essence then, teachers know that all instructional performance can be improved. One good way to improve instruction is for the teacher and administrator to agree upon areas of performance in which improvement is needed and sought at the start of the year. Then, at year's end, teachers and administrator can discuss what has been achieved or not and this can then be analyzed and evaluated. It is up to the administrator to improve communication with teachers. The effective administrator encourages free discussion, and the "sounding off" of teachers. Teachers hold that while the effective supervisor leads the teachers in the development of improved teaching methods, the evaluation that results should be utilized

---

[13]Ibid.

[14]Ibid., p.13.

for diagnostic purposes by both teacher and administrator. The principal will be able to see what the strengths and weaknesses of his staff are and can plan for extra help in improving needed areas in the coming school year. While teachers agree evaluation programs are necessary, they also believe that giving letter grades for their teaching and/or other rating types of evaluation do not improve performance because this is seen as punitive. In order to avoid what teachers see as "unfair," the effective principal states goals in measurable terms. The evaluation process is goal-oriented, the procedure is constructive rather than punitive. And the process is seen as both rational and constructive.[15]

---

[15]Ibid., pp.12-13

EVALUATION APPROACHES

If the principal is to offer effective supervision and evaluation for improvement, what approach should he/she then take? Philip A. Clark and A. L. Stefurak maintain there are two general categories the supervisor may choose between; leader-centered or facilititative.[16]

In leader-centered behavior, all common goals, together with direction and new ideas, are under the control of one person, the principal. Though this selection can be effective in certain instances, it has the disadvantage of restricting the emerging of new talent for leadership within the group. Only the principal's goals are considered, since the role of the teachers is simply one of following and giving support to those leader-selected goals.[17] Since continuous growth and achievement does not exist in this model, its essential weakness can be witnessed when the leader departs.

A more effective leader takes the facilitative leadership approach in which supervision and evaluation do not rest with one individual, but is shared by many. The skills and creative thinking of all are applied to goals that are mutually determined and defined. This

---

[16]Clark, Philip A., and A. L. Steefurak. "Leadership for Change." Community Education Journal, 5:6 (November-December, 1975), p.18.

[17]Ibid., p.19.

approach offers and encourages sensitivity in evaluation of change because the goals have been developed by the staff together rather than dictated by the principal.[18]

Clark and Stefurak see the facilitative leadership as possessing not only good interpersonal skills, but being effective in the management skills of diagnosis, prescription, treatment and evaluation. They state that interpersonal skills and management skills are not separate components but combine to create effective leaders. While these skills can be both learned and employed apart from the whole, together they can be used as tools for supervision and evaluation of group goals.[19]

Kenneth A. Berg points out that leadership is directly related to group activities; if there were no group, there would be no problems or conflict, no need to find solutions for group concerns. He believes that those who may lead in one situation, might follow in others based on individual skills, knowledge, and experience. Yet more is involved than the leader and the group. A situation must be present that requires a problem to be solved or a decision to be made or leadership is not necessary at all. Leadership may be defined as being able, within a democratic setting, to

---

[18]Ibid.

[19]Ibid., pp.19-20.

influence the group in goal-setting and goal achievement. The effective leader in the complex education field today must be able to adapt his skills to a myriad of situations. Leaders who fail to adapt, to influence change, or to inspire rational goal-setting, are ineffective in their role.[20]

Different groups, formal and informal, those with legal authority and those without, are engaged in determining the effectiveness of the supervision and evaluation techniques of the administrator. Teachers are affected by leadership in a profound and fundamental way. They are also in the position to appraise such leadership. As Richard L. Featherstone and Louis Romano say, this group's participation in such evaluation of leadership is quite controversial.[21] For example, administrators may, in the face of teacher unionism, see this appraisal of administrative effectiveness as a threat. Teachers are oftentimes in a better position to judge performance than those who have the responsibility for evaluation, such as the Board of Education and administrative superiors. The teachers, after all, can directly see the results of supervisory behavior.[22]

---

[20]Berg, Kenneth A. "Educational Leadership" The Clearing House. 50:5 (1977), pp.212-213.

[21]Featherstone, Richard L. and Louis Romano. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance" The Clearing House, vol. 50:9 (May, 1977), p.412.

[22]Ibid., pp.413-414.

Every member of the group, leader and teacher alike, must understand that accountability revolves around evaluation. It may be necessary for the effective leader to "sell" this idea to his staff. No procedure or criteria should be designed or implemented that does not deal with administrative responsibility for specific and ancillary functions, authority to take needed action, and accountability as a channel of communication, reporting to those delegating or authorizing his authority to act.[23]

Much of the emotional reaction against evaluation results from tactless imposition of the evaluative process. It implies criticism and possible decisions to continue or alter a program. Even though the evaluation task is one of his/her many administrative duties, the effective principal must realize the "evaluation done with or for those involved in a program is psychologically more acceptable than evaluation done to them."[24] In recent study of exceptional principals and teachers, it was noted that because principals have such varied administrative tasks to perform, they often do not have the time to devote to prolonged contemplation of a problem. "By virtue of their position,

---

[23]Ibid., pp.414-415.

[24]Dressel, Paul L., Handbook of Academic Evaluation, San Francisco, Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976, p.5.

principals...can stimulate, sustain, or alter expectations for performance in ways that others cannot."[25] Many teachers may find this autonomy threatening and, in the case of the ineffective administrator, it could be.

One of the most common observations in the literature gathered in this study is that the role of the principal varies with the situation. "What is effective in one situation may not be appropriate in another. Principals do not act in isolation. They must consider many factors, both internal and external...," that may affect a given situation and act accordingly.[26] This may produce differences in the way a principal's effectiveness is viewed by his teachers in the short-term evaluation. However, most principals who act upon their prescribed goals and objectives for the school year regularly succeed in the long-run. The teachers tend to view principal effectiveness in evaluation as being far less satisfactory than the principals themselves see their behavior in this area. The principal's chief task and challenge is to take the helm in the improvement of his school. In order to do this, even in a democratic model whereby the teachers have a

---

[25]Roueche, Profiling Excellence in America's Schools, p.36.

[26]Ibid., p.39.

great amount of autonomy, demands that the principal exert influence. How the teachers then perceive this use of power is a critical factor in the effectiveness of the principal in the evaluation role. Farouk Sa'ad and Russell L. Hamm emphasize that if the teachers feel an effort to influence certain behavior, or carry out change is only a ploy to increase the principal's power, then the teacher attitude will be a negative one. If this should be the case, the reason for improving organizational goals may suffer as well.[27] Teachers often regard their own knowledge of learning and instruction as equal or even superior to that of the principal. Given the rapid change and innovation in the curriculum, it is certainly true that one individual cannot be equally informed in all areas. It is against this background that Sa'ad and Hamm set out certain guidelines for effective principalship.

They do not find that the democratic principal is necessarily any more effective than the one who espouses more authoritarian methods of leadership. Instead, the effective principal, in line with teacher attitude, will present the teacher with real and vital educational problems. It is part of a principals's effectiveness that once he has provided the teacher with an actual

---

[27]Sa'ad, Farouk. "Teacher Autonomy and/or Administrative Leadership: Myth or reality?" Contemporary Education, 48:4 (Summer, 1977), p.227.

goal, teacher autonomy is supported in his/her methods of solving that problem. Individual freedom to operate must not be allowed to conflict with group goals. Therefore, the effective principal must supervise autonomy. While he/she should not evaluate what is correct and what is wrong with the specific procedure, he/she has to be able to offer feed-back based on his/her own strengths and experiences. The effective principal has the ability to balance the teacher's skills and expertise with the objectives and needs of the group.

Rouche and Baker recommend a combination of loose and tight controls on autonomy. An example of a tightly controlled environment would be teaching of a single subject by teachers at the same time every day. Open classrooms are another example in which every action by one person or group affects the other."[28] However, instructional matters are loosely coupled. The effective administrator does not allow this "looseness" to be totally loose. He uses "certain control mechanisms" to fit the task. "The principal welcomes new ideas and encourages innovation, yet at the same time exercises a reasonable amount of control over new policies and programs to ensure their legitimacy within

---

[28]Roueche, Profiling Excellence in America's Schools, p.46.

the bounds of school and district goals."[29]

A teacher's wish to have more independence can be an advantage to the efficient principal. In return for more autonomy in making decision, the teacher becomes more willing to find and correct instructional flaws. Intent can be weighed against result, means and ends compared, cause and effect analyzed within the dynamic school environment that Sa'ad and Hamm visualize.[30]

Leadership should be synonymous with action; it has the task of not only managing the already existing staff, of mediating and supporting the independent components, but through flexibility and innovation, carrying the structure beyond its present limitations. In order that this state can occur, the administrator has to rely on evaluation of educational programs.

Unfortunately, according to James Bosco, all too many of what should be key evaluations, prime tools in the designing, developing, and implementing of programs are, in actuality, worthless. It is the administrator, in most cases, who initiates the evaluation. It is the administrator who relies on evaluations in decision-making. The administrator is responsible for the end product of the evaluation process. So, in order to

---

[29]Ibid, p.48.

[30]Sa'ad, "Teacher Autonomy and/or Administrative Leadership: Myth or Reality?" p.227.

render such a process worthwhile, the administrator who is most effective will consult with all participants in potential evaluative situations. If the expected outcomes cannot be utilized after information is produced, if no decisions are possible on the basis of the data secured, the evaluation is without merit in the eyes of both the effective leader and his teachers.[31]

As Bosco points out, it is the persons who will use the data who should be the persons choosing the guidelines of the evaluation. If the teachers involved are not allowed this responsibility, little is gained. Time is lost that could be expended in a more profitable manner. Evaluations simply for the sake of amassing information offer no kind of help for educational programs. However, well-considered evaluations, says Bosco, do have an important place in the educational environment. Both teachers and the effective principal, carry out or administer activities. They note problems and question the best of educational programs. From these questions and problems come the basis for the good evaluation, one that can modify the existing program or aid the group in designing more effective learning programs in the future.[32]

---

[31]Bosco, James. "The Role of Administrator in the Improvement of Evaluation Studies." Education, 92, #2 (November-December, 1971, p.70.

[32]Ibid, pp.70-74

THE EDUCATOR'S VIEWPOINT

Teachers approach the concept of evaluation of their work in a state of ambiguity, believes J. Merrell Hansen. Even if evaluation can be made useful, is it really possible to rate something so personal and individual as classroom teaching? Hansen states that even the most successful teacher may not be performing in accordance with what the school or school district thinks is good teaching. The teacher's attitude then, may reflect the unfairness of being assessed from angles other than their own. He or she, after all, possesses a certain style and unique qualities. Teachers might answer that student learning should be the sole criterion on which they should be judged. Certainly good teaching would seem to lead directly to a high degree of student learning. The idea, however, that this should be the only relevant point to teacher evaluation is flawed reasoning according to Hansen.[33] The terms such as teacher effectiveness or teacher characteristics can only arouse confusion among teachers since there are no universal answers.

Another factor the principal must consider in dealing with teachers' reactions to evaluations is the union position. As teacher's unions have become more

---

[33]Hansen, J. Merrell. "The Evaluation of Teaching: No Guppies or Goldfish in My Classroom" NASSP Bulletin, 62, #416 (March, 1978), pp.12-13.

militant in the last twenty years, more and more disagreements and misunderstanding have come about because of the use and abuse of the evaluation process. The effective administrator must consider all factors relating to a teaching program before making a recommendation for change. He must make every effort to help the teachers and their union understand the purpose of the evaluative tool and its proper use. Only in this way can the principal gain the cooperation and input needed from teachers to make intelligent decisions.[34]

Teachers may rightly feel that human interrelationships, varied classroom activities, innovation and experimentation carried out by the teacher are ignored in the evaluative process because it is difficult if not impossible to rate them on some standard scale. In such an atmosphere, the evaluation may be threatening. The effective administrator avoids fear and distrust by acknowledging the varieties and variables found in the individual classroom. He/she makes sure the teacher understands and accepts the criterion which will be used for the evaluation. The process must remain objective, demonstrable, and appropriate. This is facilitated by effective

---

[34]Taft, Philip, United They Teach: The Story of the United Federation of Teachers, Los Angeles, CA, Nash Publishing, 1974, p.139.

communication between teachers and principal. Even more vital perhaps, the results of the evaluation are always to be viewed as more important than the evaluation itself.[35]

If teacher evaluation is to help make teaching more successful, it cannot begin and end with simply an observation or activity. The results of the evaluation and ways to improve have to be fully communicated. the effective administrator sets out what the intended results or outcomes are to be. These might be the improvement of teacher performances, the assessing of experimental programs, improved student learning, or the determination of retention and dismissal policies. Whatever the criteria and the results, Hansen asserts that evaluation does have a decided purpose. Evaluation can help teachers become more committed to the profession, help them look with a more critical eye at their own performance and that of others, and can aid them in gaining knowledge already possessed by others. Only when these concepts are not fully and clearly stated by the administrator does the evaluation become futile, frustrating, and frightening to the teacher involved.[36]

Mel J. Zelanak and Bill C. Snider have conducted

---

[35]Hansen, "The Evaluation of Teaching," p.13.

[36]Ibid.

studies related to the Hansen hypothesis, dealing with the view of teachers toward the process of teacher evaluation. Their research indicated that those teachers who felt the reason of the evaluation was for administrative purposes, had negative feelings about it. Those teachers who believed the intent of the evaluation was for instructional purposes took a far more positive view of the procedure.[37] The Zelanak-Snyder study surveyed 400 Iowa teachers about their attitude toward evaluation. It was learned that those teachers who felt evaluations were only for administrative purposes had lower opinions of the school's educational programs. The results of this study seem quite conclusive that those teachers who believe the evaluation has constructive instructional purposes have a supportive attitude toward evaluation. Those teachers who see the intent of evaluation as pertaining to administrative purposes including tenure, promotion, dismissal, re-assignment and salary adopt a negative attitude in response.[38] The effective administrator can build from the conclusions demonstrated in this study. He/she can, through the medium of communication, offer reassurances

---

[37]Zelanak, Mel J. and Bill C. Snider. "Teacher Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Process." California Journal of Educational Research, XXV, #3 pp.117-119.

[38]Ibid. pp.119-120.

of the purpose of the evaluation, emphasizing the instructional purpose if such is indeed the intent of the evaluation process.

Even the instructional intent of evaluation does not ensure the results will be utilized effectively if the administrator is not efficient in this area. Gary B. Box illustrates some of the problems that one might encounter in attempting such utilization. For example, outcomes, especially negative ones, do little to suggest how the educational program or teaching behavior can best be revised. The evaluation data may not be as important as other issues such as group conflict over goals or purpose.[39] Cox stresses the fact that outcome may not be communicated to the staff in a usable form. Results will be irrelevant if the evaluation focused on questions that had no real interest or value to the teachers.

The application of evaluation has several definite limitations. For instance, the results of the evaluation are not the only source of information available to the administrator. Results of evaluation are used both to the degree and in a way that fits in with the concepts and interests of the administrator. Therefore, simply because an evaluation has been made

---

[39]Cox, Gary B. "Managerial Style: Implications for the Utilization of Program Evaluation Information." Evaluation Quarterly, 1, #3 (August, 1977), pp.499-500.

does not mean that changes in programs will take place. The administrator's needs are not necessarily those of the teachers. Any evaluation, to be useful and meaningful, must allow for the differing characteristics of individual leadership.[40] Data once secured, even if ignored or passed over for a time, might later be revived and become viable.

While literature to the contrary exists, it would be wrong to state that teachers categorically reject and view negatively the entire idea of accountability through evaluation processes. In a multi-state study involving some 300 teachers, Thomas L. Good and others discovered this negativity was far from the real feelings of many teachers.[41] About 24 percent of the teachers surveyed agreed, in theory, with the idea that the performance of teachers should be evaluated and those who do well should receive more rewards. The majority, 55 percent, were generally positive toward this stance, while holding some reservations. Only six percent of those polled were completely opposed to the notion of performance evaluations. The research indicated that teachers downgrade the importance of standardized tests.[42]

---

[40]Ibid.

[41]Good, Thomas L. et. al. "How Teachers View Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan, 56, #5 (January, 1979), p.367.

[42]Ibid., p.367.

The Good study reflects the attitude of teachers regarding accountability and evaluation in several ways. The interest expressed by teachers in the effective elements of education make it evident that accountability must be related to this issue. The study also implies that negative attitudes toward evaluation generally stem from non-belief in current accountability methodology and lack of consensus about what should be measured. While about 80 percent of the teachers reacted favorably to some elements of accountability, this may merely be hypothetical in nature. While the teachers felt that accountability was good, this does not necessarily mean they wish the practice implemented in their own school.[43]

The NEA, in 1977, conducted a poll of its members on some of the aspects connected to accountability for teachers. While the Good study emphasized the lack of faith teachers generally displayed toward standardized testing as the means to measure student progress, the NEA found that 51 percent of the schools relied on this method.[44] This was supported by district school boards, even though group standardized test scores have been found to be unreliable indicators of individual

---

[43]Ibid., pp.367-368.

[44]NEA Research. "Accountability for Teachers." Today's Education, 66:3 (September-October) 1977, p.23.

achievement. Nearly a third of these schools released the scores attained on these tests to the public as a means of measuring teacher accountability. The majority of the teachers stated that the use of such tests either had no effect, or, even worse, a negative one.[45]

---

[45]Ibid.

WHAT'S A PRINCIPAL TO DO/

If the effective administrator agrees with the majority of his teachers that group standardized testing is not the best means of evaluation for teacher accountability, are there more "enlightened" observations of the teacher at work? John T. Lovell and Margaret S. Phelps researched a group of Tennessee teachers and supervisors on their attitudes in these areas. While it was learned that the principal was the prime source of observation and conferences, with 73 percent of the teachers stating they had one or more such observations and 82 percent reporting one or more conferences, another aspect, crucial for evaluation emerged. Most conferences and observations lasted less than 30 minutes, with many under 10 minutes in length. Conferences were not based on the findings of the observations, which themselves were uncontrolled, unplanned, haphazard, and not seen by the teachers as helpful.[46]

Other findings of the Lovell-Phelps study revealed further possible causes for teachers to view evaluation rather negatively. Over 50 percent were not offered help by their administrators when needed in such matters

---

[46]Lovell, John T. and Margaret S. Phelps. "Supervision in Tennessee as Perceived by Teachers, Principals, and Supervisors." Educational Leadership, December, 1977, pp.226-227.

as development of curriculum, selection of methods for evaluating students, describing and analyzing instruction objectives and aid in defining such objectives. More than 70 percent of the teachers indicated they wished an increase in these concerns that would draw on their professional expertise.[47]

The Lovell-Phelps reports serves to illustrate once again that even the effective principal places most emphasis on his/her administrative role rather than the role of educational leader. This is particularly unfortunate when there has been the teachers' expressed wishes to be offered just such leadership. Teachers are confronted with evaluation, held accountable for their efforts, yet are being denied an effective system of instructional services and support. In light of this apparent contradiction, an NEA teacher opinion poll deserves our attention. A nationwide sampling showed that more teachers today than several years ago desire increased involvement in school policy-making. The largest area of under-involvement is in the procedures surrounding the selection of the school principal; 52 percent of the teachers felt the need to be more involved in this area. That this is directly related to attitude toward evaluation can be understood when we remember that the principal is the chief evaluator of

---

[47]Ibid., p.227.

his teachers.[48]

In other areas of concern, the teachers found themselves under-involved in curriculum decisions (43.4%), selection of textbooks (35.4%), and procedures for teacher evaluation (47.4%). Importantly, more women than men showed under-involvement in curriculum decisions (45% compared to 40.9%). While men indicated greater under-involvement than women, the proportion of uninvolved women teachers has been growing at a faster pace than among their male peers since 1968.[49] It should be evident then, that the effective administrator must assure more involvement in policy making to his teachers if evaluation is to be regarded in a favorable light by teachers.

One immediately recognizable problem is the fact that, since female teachers tend to have a lesser role in the decision-making processes, it is difficult for them to move into leadership positions. A support system, good training opportunities, fair recruitment and selection procedures, and cultural bias, all are factors in the small number of women in significant leadership posts in education according to an article in

---

[48]NEA Research. "Involvement in School Policy Making." Today's Education, 62:2 (February) 1973, p.11

[49]Ibid., pp.11-12.

News Exchange.[50] However, it must be pointed out that many women teachers do not desire administrative jobs; they are oftentimes content with classroom teaching. Concern for status has not been as noted among women as men. Another issue relating to women and leadership is the lack of access to information; there is no "old girl's network" operating as communication channels for job data to be generated along. Perhaps of even more importance is that women do not consider themselves leadership material as is evident by the vast majority of male administrators. Women have not yet grown comfortable with the idea of power as vested in themselves. While teaching is regarded as "woman's work," leadership is held as a male reserve.

This problem cannot be resolved until teachers are treated s professionals, including the females in the profession. Basic attitudes of both the public and educational personnel will have to be altered. Policy-making and problem-solving groups have been male dominated, giving women little chance to develop administrative capabilities. If women are to feel involved on all levels, the effective administrator will have to open up these processes to include women. As womens attitudes express more willingness to assume

---

[50]News Exchange Issue. "Why Are There So Few Women in Leadership Positions in Education?" ASCD News Exchange, 21, #8 (December, 1979), p.4.

added responsibility, expend time and energy in these new roles, attitudes toward evaluation will change as well.[51]

Harris A. Taylor explains some of the reasons behind the actual decrease in the number of women in educational administration. It has long been believed that men have more administrative ability than do women. Yet data has proven that women test just as high in such ability and skill as do males. In one experiment based on typical administrative problems, women principals were given a higher evaluation than did the men. Indeed, women principals as a group possess certain traits that make them highly desirable for such posts. For example, the women are more inclined toward participative decision-making. They utilize the results of evaluations in contemplating action. Since most women administrators come from the teaching ranks themselves, they are highly concerned with teaching, student participation, and evaluation of learning. They are more willing to take on instructional leadership together with administrative tasks.[52]

Sex of the administrator does not relate to effectiveness. Discrimination, as Taylor points out, is

---

[51]Ibid., pp.4-5.

[52]Taylor, Harris A. "Women in Administration." American School and University, December, 1963, p.22.

a vicious circle, for those men who have never worked under a woman principal tend to hold the most unfavorable view of women as administrators. And since so few women do attain these roles, few men will ever undergo attitude change through the experience of working for the female principal. But the actual barrier to women as administrators, according to Taylor, seems to rest in the lack of motivation among effective female teachers to even aspire to leadership positions. While 46 percent of male elementary teachers expressed interest in becoming principals, only 7.8 percent of the female teachers showed the desire to do so. While in one graduate school of education 279 men enrolled in courses of school administration, only 101 women were preparing themselves in this manner for leadership roles in the future.[53] Yet it is also true that the effective administrator, by means of early identification, active recruiting, support systems and encouragement, as well as professional growth programs, can bring women into administration roles.

---

[53]Ibid., p.22-23.

PARTICIPATORY MANAGEMENT

Frederick C. Wendel researched the attitudes of 113 Wyoming principals in areas relating to bringing more people into participatory management. Most of the principals agreed that participatory decision-making within one's own area of responsibility, sharing information with colleagues and mutual performance goal setting were worthy concepts and would raise teacher morale. However, even though they agreed with these ideas, it was found that most administrators did not follow them.[54] Further, the principals polled believed that the teachers would be the group most apt to profit from these practices. The principal was perceived to reap few benefits if these techniques were initiated into the school environment.[55]

From the data gathered in this effort, Wendel concluded that many administrators doubt the effectiveness of democratic practices. Most held the strongest faith in their own ability and skills in coming to decisions, taking responsibility, and holding the reins of authority. While more democratic ideas were often voiced, they were accepted only for subordinates. The principals themselves saw the

---

[54]Wendel, Frederick C. "Attitudes of Principals Toward Participatory Managerial Practices." The Clearing House, 50:7 (March, 1977) p.322.

[55]Ibid., p.322-325.

practice of participation for themselves as decreasing while their responsibilities increased.[56]

A New England study based on questioners distributed at random to 2,000 teachers and administrators serves to further clarify the Wendel research. The Curcio sampling was undertaken to learn how both teachers and administration perceive the organizational climate of their school. Employing a scale of one to five, the questions were designed to rank responses from a very authoritarian system to a very participatory system. While findings between the two groups in each school were quite similar, it is significant that more supervisors saw the school as quite democratic in such areas as decision-making than did the teachers.[57] Most items in the questionnaire were rated as three or above, indicating generally positive feelings toward the school climate.

The Curcio sampling revealed as well that both teachers and administrators felt that innovation and change as well as goal-setting has to be conducted in the future. The response shows that all is not yet ideal in the schools. Much remains to be done. It is obvious that an effective administrator is a necessary

---

[56]Ibid., p.326.

[57]Curcio, Ronald P. "Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of the Organizational Climate of Their School Systems." Contemporary Education, 45:3, p.227.

component in pre-service and in-service training to improve the climate of the school. One suggestion given is that of having administrators return to the classroom to teach at periodic intervals, while teachers become directly involved in administrative tasks. Both groups through this experience, become better acquainted with the problems of the other. This will help in improving interpersonal relations and increasing effectiveness at the same time.[58] Resistance to change and innovation would be lowered at all levels.

As Leonard L. Murdy states, "unless there are good working relationships, the whole organization is likely to be ineffective and wasteful. Basically, the effectiveness of a local school district is determined by the quantity and quality of the staff."[59] Fostering constructive working relationships is a task of the administrator. Perhaps the single most important skill the administrator can have, according to Murdy, is the ability to get along and work in an effective manner with people. Murdy polled the opinions of 628 teachers to discover what qualities make up both good and bad working relationships. From this sampling, a profile and scale were constructed. In rank order, 225 of the

---

[58]Ibid., pp.226-227.

[59]Murdy, Leonard L. "Effectiveness of Administrative Working Relationships." Administrative Working Relationships Profile and Scale, 1975, p.22.

individuals, 36 percent, listed first that the successful administrator was "reasonable, considerate, fair, and sincere."[60] In second place, close behind with 221 responses, was "mutual respect, trust, integrity, and honesty." In third spot was the talent of being an effective communicator, and a good listener.[61]

In another contribution to the literature dealing with administrative effectiveness, Cecil G. Miskel sees such effectiveness as composed of three parts: new ideas, evaluation by subordinates, and evaluation by supervisors or administrative superiors.[62] Yet evaluation is not as straightforward as this would seem warns Miskel. "Situational factors, characteristics of the school environment, must be considered. Among these would be the technology level utilized in administrative practices and the interpersonal climate which exists in the school."[63] It is these situational factors which complicate evaluating the effectiveness of the administrator.

---

[60]Ibid., p.24.

[61]Ibid.

[62]Miskel, Cecil G. "Principals' Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation." Educational Administration Quarterly, 13:1 (Winter, 1977), pp.31-34.

[63]Ibid., p.44.

Principals' effectiveness can be partially considered on the basis of previous performance in a similar situation. No two situations can be exactly alike and cannot be compared to any degree of preciseness. While past performance on which favorable perception is founded may have displayed competency and effectiveness, it may have merely been the situational factor which gave this effect.[64]

The concept of how the principal is perceived and how effective he/she is has been the subject of an article by Rita Mize. Based on the findings of a 1974-75 California School Effectiveness study, among high achieving schools, principals are perceived as offering high levels of support to the teachers.[65] The form of this support was varied. In instructional-related areas, adequate materials and support for new ideas and special projects were provided. Support was also given in areas other than instruction. Among these were student discipline, relationships with parents and the larger community, and consensus on decision making processes.[66]

Joseph Sanacore has written on the subject of an instrument devised by the Hauppauge School District to

---

[64]Ibid., p.45.

[65]Ibid., p.30.

[66]Ibid., p.30.

measure the effectiveness of their principals. Items related to administration and supervision, professional and personal characteristics, relationships with staff, students, and community are assessed in terms of a scale ranging from 0 (lacking sufficient information to evaluate the item) to 5 (always).[67] The instrument is used at the end of each school year.

Another instrument for principal evaluation is the Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory. The WPEI is designed for rating the principal as to his fulfillment of the role his teachers expect of him in relation to various school problems. Prepared by Richard I. Andrews, the scale ranges from the principal always fulfilling the responsibility to never doing so. There are 64 statements listed on the WPEI form, covering the full spectrum of tasks associated with principalship, personal and professional characteristics, and interpersonal relationships.[68]

The CIRCE Attitude Scale No. 1.4 is a means of gathering opinions on a number of statements about attitudes toward educational evaluation. Each statement can be marked agree, disagree, or blank (neither). The

---

[67]Sanacore, Joseph "How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principals." NASSP Bulletin, 60:402 (October, 1976), pp.98-101.

[68]Andrews, Richard I. Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory, Bureau of School Services and Research, 1975, pp.1-4.

CIRCE is a means of tabulating a number of teacher attitudes toward evaluation, both negative and positive. It also asks what the teachers themselves feel should be the reasons for evaluation, if they think evaluation is worthwhile, or if they believe evaluation results in better programs and instruction.[69]

Ernest R. House suggests that what is needed in educational evaluation is something that exists "beyond accountability." Evaluation is not a stable concept, but may have effects which have little to do with prior established objectives. "Evaluation must change, grow and develop along with the program or project if such evaluation is to remain viable. The primary criterion of internal consistency, once of prime importance to evaluators, should no longer be considered the major point of focus in the evaluation process. Instead, the evaluation must be responsive to the program itself."[70] It may be more democratic to base the evaluation on case study methods. In this instance, conclusions and decisions are not explicitly the function of the evaluator, but instead are reached by those reading the report. Another technique is that of teachers working

---

[69]CIRCE Attitude Scale No. 1.4, Attitudes Toward Educational Leadership, 1976.

[70]House, Ernest R. Beyond Accountability, Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers, edited by Thomas J. Sergiovanni. Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1975, p.74.

in groups to define problems. During this exercise, the teachers learn skills by becoming students in their own classroom. Hopefully, this role reversal will help the teachers become more aware of their own shortcomings, and help them exhibit a greater effort to correct those problems thus identified.[71]

House warns that these ideas do not imply more efficiency. They are intended to foster more democracy, more flexibility and the utilization of many sources for the improvement of handling educational programs. Still greater efficiency and productivity are not the sole source of legitimate control or accountability. "If teachers and students have little control over the ends they pursue, in determining what is to be done and the means employed, negative attitudes must be expected for accountability of the end product."[72]

External controls and excessive supervision, far from furthering effectiveness and accountability, can only lead to less responsibility and commitment of both teachers and their administrators. More professionalism, not less, is recommended by House. The "collegial" kind of internal organization is one desirable technique. "In short, while teachers can be evaluated in terms of the methods they use in carrying

---

[71]Ibid., pp.74-75.

[72]Ibid., p.75.

out their own and society's purposes, they are not responsible for the guaranteed outcome."[73]

The principal's responsibility to his/her school and to the teaching staff is clear--a participatory atmosphere toward evaluations. Time must be spent speaking with teachers and listening to their opinions concerning curriculum, discipline, and other concerns, while still retaining final policy and procedure decisions. The ability of the principal to accomplish these goals relies not only on his/her experiences as a teacher and/or administrator but also on the personality traits that allow him/her to accept constructive criticism from subordinates and act upon the suggestions presented with tact and dispatch. Training oneself to accomplish these goals and so present a positive attitude toward the evaluation process, a valuable tool when used correctly, should be an incentive to every aspiring principal to improve relations within his/her school. When frustrations because of lack of communication are allowed to fester, the work of education becomes more difficult for not only the administrator and the teacher, but also for the student, this country's most valuable resource.

---

[73]Ibid., p.76.

SUMMARY OF SIGNIFICANT FINDINGS

Basically teachers' attitudes towards being evaluated depend on two main factors. First, they want to have input into the evaluation process and they want the evaluation to be used as a tool to help them. Teachers wish to be part of a cooperative effort in the educational program. They want to work with the principal in defining problems or needs and finding ways of dealing with them. This should be done in a way that is helping and not one that is set up to be used as a rating of disciplinary tactic against them.

The principal must be the facilitator of instruction. Ideally, he would be the master teacher. His primary role would be to improve instruction, and most teachers would like their principal to help, coach and evaluate them with this in mind. However, many teachers feel the need to have more help given by their principal in matters such as development of curriculum and improvement of instruction.

Most of the teachers felt a definite need for supervision and evaluation, although very few favored evaluation from their principal and more than half saw their supervisor as potentially dangerous when cast as an evaluator. Some teachers feel that evaluation is done only for administrative purposes and they had low opinions of the school's educational programs. Teachers

who believe the intent of the evaluation was for instructional purposes had a more positive view of the procedure.

Teachers view evaluation as only one way of improving teacher performance. All teachers in one poll felt that they must play a major role in developing and selecting an evaluation program.

A collegial collaborative leadership approach in which supervision and evaluation are shared by many seemed to be more desirable than a leader-centered approach. In this method the skills, knowledge and thoughts of all are applied to goals that are mutually determined and defined. Evaluation done with or for those involved is more acceptable and taken with greater positive feeling than an evaluation done to them.

The other main factor which affects teachers' attitudes toward being evaluated is how they view their principal's effectiveness. Teachers find effective principals to be good communicators. The principal communicates his/her thoughts and ideas and listens to the staff as well. This skill would help in evaluation which is done in a mutually established approach of a facilitative rather than a leader-centered principal. This type of leader is not only good at interpersonal skills, but also the skills of diagnosis, prescription and treatment of problems. Interpersonal and

management skills when combined make for better supervision and leadership.

The educational field today is certainly complex and the principal must be knowledgeable in many areas. He/she must be able to adapt his/her skills and knowledge to a myriad of situations and be adept at using a variety of approaches.

The principal sets the direction of the school. He/she has a strong influence on the educational process within the school. In order to do this, the principal must first be informed of and aware of the various approaches to curriculum and instruction. He/she must be able to read about successes and failures of others in his/her immediate concerns. He/she must be able to attend workshops and educational courses. Most important, he/she must never stop studying and learning. When a principal thinks he/she has all the answers and knows exactly what will always work in the situations, he/she is through as an effective and innovative principal.

The principal's main job is to take the lead in the improvement of his/her school. This demands that the principal must influence the behavior of the professional staff rather than merely ordering and directing to increase the principal's power. Unfortunately, even good principals often place too much

emphasis on their role of manager, rather than on their role as leader. Most principals agreed only in theory that participatory decision-making, sharing information with colleagues and mutual performance goal setting were worthy concepts and would raise teacher morale. Also, more principals than teachers viewed their school as democratic in areas such as decision-making.

The effectiveness of the local school district is determined by the quantity and quality of the work of the staff. Perhaps the single most important skill an administrator can have is the ability to get along and work well with people. Fostering constructive working relationships among staff is the job of the principal. Along with being a good communicator, other traits found to be important for the principal were being reasonable, fair, considerate and sincere. Teachers also wanted a leader who showed mutual respect, trust, integrity and honesty.

CONCLUSIONS, IMPLEMENTATIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

It is evident from the research that most teachers believe that evaluations should show an understanding of the educational beliefs and values of the teachers and how the teacher views his own profession. With such and understanding, more effective teaching programs can be designed, learning programs successfully implemented, and evaluations made a positive, rather than a destructive process.

Teachers feel, and principals agreed, that the principal's spend most of their time being business manager. However, teachers would like their principal to assume the position of a master teacher and give them more direction and help.

As a teacher, the author was lucky enough to have principals who asked for input in developing curriculum, diagnosis, prescription and testing of students, and teacher evaluation from the staff. As a new school district there was no established curriculum, management programs or formal evaluation process. The principal gave us instructions to come up with plans in different areas. The staff first met without the principal, brainstormed ideas and came up with a tentative plan which was then discussed with the principal and finalized. By working together in this way, the author felt the staff supported and worked hard toward

achieving their goals and therefore had a positive attitude toward their evaluation.

The principal has several ways in which he/she can help improve teacher evaluation. To begin with, he/she must work closely with his/her teachers. He/she must help each teacher find out just where he fits into the educational process. He should encourage them to meet with him and discuss their educational aims, purposes and teaching strategies.

The principal provides for in-service training of his/her teachers on a regular basis. This may take the role of after-school conferences or release-time during the school days. In these sessions, the teachers are able to see and learn some of the new techniques and ideas in their fields. By actively promoting these sessions, the principal shows that he/she is truly concerned with the improvement of his/her staff and school.

The principal must encourage his/her staff to work together. While no principal can make all of his/her teachers like each other, he can set a tone and provide an atmosphere where they can work together. One of the ways in which this can be done is to maintain an open relationship with the teachers. If the teachers feel free to come in and discuss problems with the principal, a sense of trust is established. With openness being a

policy of the principal, it is hoped that many of the disagreements which occur in any school may be averted.

In another area, the principal must constantly be supervisor and evaluating all programs in his school. He must be as familiar with the old methods as with the new innovative ones. He/she must be able to look at each program with an objective viewpoint. The principal must be able to spot the difficulties or shortcomings of these programs and institute changes in order to improve their effectiveness. To do so, he needs to have a great deal of patience and tact, as well as determination. He/she must make the teachers involved in the programs realize the difficulties, and then guide them in making the necessary changes. At this point, the question of good relations between the teacher and the principal becomes crucial.

The principal must encourage the spirit of inquiry and challenge in his teachers. He/she must provide an atmosphere where his/her teachers will feel free to try innovative programs. He/she must also, having satisfied himself that the proposed programs are educationally sound, be prepared to assist the teachers in carrying out these programs. It may take the finding of money for special finds for equipment and supplies, or suggesting new techniques of instruction. In any case, the role of the principal in making the new program work

is as important as that of the teacher.

As a facilitator of education, the principal is also responsible for a host of other duties that affect the performance of his teachers in the classroom. He/she is responsible for providing his/her teachers with the tools of their trade. It is the principal's duty to obtain the materials and equipment needed for the educational process. He/she must ensure that his/her teachers have the best materials that are available within the budget. He/she must also ensure that his/her teachers have the authority to select the materials that they feel best fulfill these needs.

The principal is also responsible for the problem of discipline in the school. Without discipline being well enforced, needless to say, the educational process cannot take place. The principal must learn to discipline without putting the students and teachers in an educational straight-jacket.

The question of scheduling is also an important one in the facilitation of education. Without a sensible and well thought out plan of scheduling, time will be badly spent or lost, and the educational process harmed. Unintelligent scheduling can sabotage the most well thought out educational plan.

This author feels that principals need to spend more time truly communicating with their staff as a

whole and in small groups. Classroom environment, instructional plans, interaction with students, management of record-keeping, parent/community relations and professionalism are seldom dealt with after a teacher leaves college or may never have truly been addressed at all.

Teachers agree that they do not want an evaluation in which the principal examines and judges their performance to determine its quality. Principals should remember this and think of themselves as a supervisor. Objectives of supervision should help the teacher pinpoint areas of his/her teaching performance which need improvement and focus on how to improve them. The principal and teacher, or teachers if goals are similar, should work together to develop a constructive plan to improve their quality of teaching and their school.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Andrews, Richard I. "Washington Principal Evaluation Inventory." Bureau of School Services and Research, 1975.

Berg, Kenneth A. "Educational Leadership." The Clearing House. 50:5 (1977) pp. 212-214.

Bosco, James. "The Role of Administrator in the Improvement of Evaluation Studies." Education, 92:2 (November-December, 1971), pp. 70-74.

Castetter, William B. Personnel Functiion in Education Administratiion. 3rd ed., New York, NY: Macmillan Co., 1981.

CIRCE Attitude Scale No. 1.4 Attitudes Toward Educational Evaluation.

Clark, Phillip A., and A. L. Stefurak. "Leadership for Change." Community Education Journal, 5:6 (November-December, 1975), pp. 18-20.

Cox, Gary B. "Managerial Style: Implications for the Utilization of Program Evaluation Information." Evaluation Quarterly, 1:3 (August, 1977), pp. 499-509.

Curcio, Ronald P. "Teacher and Administrator Perceptions of the Organizational Climate of Their School Systems." Contemporary Education, 45:3 (Spring, 1974), pp. 222-228.

Dressel, Paul L. Halndbook of Academic Evaluation, San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1976.

Featherstone, Richard L., and Louis Romano. "Evaluation of Administrative Performance." The Clearing House, 50:9 (May, 1977), pp. 412-415

Fortunato, Ray and Geneva Wadell. Personnel Administration in High Education. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass Publishers, 1981.

Furtwengler, W. J., "Implementing Strategies for a School Effectiveness Program." Phi Delta Kappan, December, 1985, pp. 262-265.

Genova, William J. et al. Mutual Benefit Evaluation of Faculty and Administrators in Higher Education. Cambridge, MA: University Microfilms, 1976.

Good, Thomas L., et al. "How Teachers View Accountability." Phi Delta Kappan, 56:5 (January, 1975), pp. 367-368.

Hansen, J. Merrell. "The Evaluation of Teaching: No Guppies or Goldfish in My Classroom." NASSP Bulletin, 62:416 (March, 1978), pp. 11-15.

Harris, Ben M., et al. Personnel Administration in Education, 2nd ed., New York, Allyn Publishers, 1985.

House, Erniest R. "Beyond Accountability." Professional Supervision for Professional Teachers edited by Thomas J. Sergiovanni. Associatiion for Supervision and Curriculum Development, Washington, D.C., 1975.

Lovell, John T. and Margaret S. Phelps. "Supervision in Tennessee as Perceived by Teachers, Principals, and Supervisors." Educational Leadership, December 1977,pp.226-228.

Miskel, Cecil G. "Principals' Perceived Effectiveness, Innovation Effort, and the School Situation." Educational Administratiion Quarterly, 13:1 (Winter, 1977), pp. 31-46.

Mize, Rita. "Principals Provide Strong Support in High-Achieving Schools." Thrust for Educational Leadership, 7:3 (January, 1978), pp. 29-30.

Murdy, Leonard L. "Effectiveness of Administrative Working Relationships." Administrative Working Relationships Profile and Scale, 1975, pp. 22-24.

NEA Research. "Accountability for Teachers." Today's Education, 66:3 (September-October, 1977), p. 23.

NEA Research. "Involvement in School Policy Making." Today's Education, 62:2 (February, 1973), pp. 11-12.

News Exchange Issue. "Why Are There So Few Women in Leadership Positions in Education?" ASCD News Exchange, 21:8 (December, 1979), pp. 4-5.

Roueche, John E. and George A. Baker, III. Profiling Excellence in America's Schools, Arlington, kVA: American Association of School Administrators, 1986.

Rutherford, W. L. "School Principals as Effective Leaders" Phi Delta Kappan, September, 1985, pp. 31-34.

Sa'ad, Farouk and Russell L. Hamm. "Teacher Autonomy and/or Administrative Leadership: Myth or Reality?" Contemporary Education, 48:4 (Summer, 1977), pp. 225-227.

Sanacore, Joseph. "How Teachers Can Evaluate Their Principals." NASSP Bulletin, 60:402 (October, 1976), pp. 98-101.

Taft, Philip, United They Teach: The Story of the United Federation of Teachers, Los Angeles, CA, Nash Publishing, 1974, p. 139.

Taylor, Harris A. "Women in Administration." American School and University, December, 1963, pp. 21-23.

Wendel, Frederick C. "Attitudes of Principals Toward Participatory Managerial Practices." The Clearing House, 50:7 (March, 1977), pp. 322-326.

Young, James N. and Robert L. Heichberger. "Teachers' Perceptions of an Effective School Supervision and Evaluation Program." Education, 96:1 (Fall, 1975), pp. 10-19.

Zelanak, Mel J. and Bill C. Snider. "Teachers Perceptions of the Teacher Evaluation Process." California Journal of Educational Research, XXV:3, pp. 116-120.